

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,840	03/30/2004	Ahmed Kamal	U 015115-2	3119
7590 02/01/2006		EXAMINER		
William R. Evans			KIFLE, BRUCK	
Ladas & Parry 26 West 61 Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
New York, NY 10023			1624	

DATE MAILED: 02/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/812,840	KAMAL ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	_			
	Bruck Kifle, Ph.D.	1624				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a red will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON to the cause the application to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. EANDONED (95 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30	March 2004					
,	nis action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allow		ers, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under	•	-				
Disposition of Claims		,				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are pending in the application	on.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are rejected.		•				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	:					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.					
Application Papers	•					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	oor	•				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a		by the Evaminer				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre		• •				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the I	•					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C. 8	119(a)-(d) or (f)				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	griphority under de c.c.c. 3					
<u> </u>	 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 					
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the pri	•					
application from the International Bure	-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	received.				
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date				
 Notice of Dialisperson's Fatent Drawing Review (FTO-946) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0: Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>08/06/04</u>. 		formal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- i) It is suggested to replace the phrase "novel pyrrolo[2,1-c][1,4]benzodiazepine" with "compound" in claims 1-9 and, similarly, it is suggested to replace "2-flouoro pyrrolo[2,1-c][1,4] benzodiazepines" with "compound" in claim 10 and 21. The language is not precise to name the compounds and appears to suggest more than what is positively being recited in the claims.
- ii) Claims 1-9 do not end in a period.
- iii) In claim 1 the structural formula needs to be labeled as formula IX. Appropriate correction is required.
- iv) Claims 26 and 27 are written as an independent claim. Applicants need to either insert formula IX along with the definitions of the variables into the claims or rewrite the claims as dependent claims.

Claim 31 provides for the use of a compound, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex*

Art Unit: 1624

parte Dunki, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd. App. 1967) and Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification does not provide enablement for the treatment of cancer generally. No compound has ever been found that can treat cancers generally even though massive efforts have been directed towards this end. Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in oncology, proof must be provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits. Nearly all anti-cancer drugs are effective against only a limited group of related tumors. Therefore, a compound effective against cancer generally would be a revolutionary exception. Applicant is asserting that he succeeded where others have failed. Where extensive efforts have all failed, it is reasonable for the Patent and Trademark Office to require proof that the claimed invention actually works for this specific utility. It is well established that a utility rejection is proper when scope of enablement is not reasonably correlated to the scope of the claims. (In re Vaeck 20 USPQ2d 1439, 1444, In re Ferens 163 USPQ 609).

In re Buting 163 USPQ 689 establishes that even clinical tests showing that a compound found to be useful in the treatment of two types of cancers was not sufficient for a much broader range.

Art Unit: 1624

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bruck Kifle, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0668. The examiner can normally be reached Tuesdays to Fridays between 8:30 AM and 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. James Wilson can be reached on 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Bruck Kifle, Ph.D. Primary Examiner Art Unit 1624

BK January 27, 2006